



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/789,453

02/27/2004

Christophe Michot

HQM-00304

5181

26339 7590 04/05/2007  
MUIRHEAD AND SATURNELLI, LLC  
200 FRIBERG PARKWAY, SUITE 1001  
WESTBOROUGH, MA 01581

EXAMINER

KOPEC, MARK T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1751

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

04/05/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/789,453

Applicant(s)

MICHOT ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Kopec

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/125,797.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                 | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

Art Unit: 1751

This application is a CON of S.N. 09/858,439 (filed 05/16/01, now ABN), which application is a CON of S.N. 09/125,797 (filed 12/03/98, now U.S. 6,319,428). The preliminary amendment filed 02/27/04 is entered. Claim 1 is currently pending.

Applicant should update the CON data appearing at page 1 of the specification.

The IDS filed 01/08/07 has been considered.

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 09/125,797, filed on 12/03/98.

The examiner will consider information which has been considered by the Office in a parent application when examining:

- (A) a continuation application filed under 37 C.F.R. §1.53(b),
- (B) a divisional application filed under 37 CFR 1.53(b), or (C)

a continuation- in-part application filed under 37 CFR 1.53(b). A listing of the information need not be resubmitted in the continuing application unless the applicant desires the information to be printed on the patent.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1751

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

At each occurrence in the instant claim, applicant should amend the terminology "possibly" to --optionally--.

The terminology "including" and "such as" in claim 1 is considered exemplary and therefore indefinite. See MPEP 2173.05(d). Correction is required.

Also, in order to conform to current U.S. practice, applicant should amend each recited Markush group to -selected from the group consisting of--.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 1751

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 15-21, 30-46 of U.S. Patent No. 6,319,428. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the instant claim and the claims of 6,319,428 are drawn to ionic compounds consisting of cation/anionic amide or salts thereof. The instant claims are merely broader in scope if failing to require the presence of solvent.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the

Art Unit: 1751

invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to

Art Unit: 1751

point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by either Banks et al (*N-Halogeno Compounds...*) or Petrov et al (*Synthesis of polyfluoro-2-alkanesulfonyl-3,3-dialkyloxaziridines*).

Banks et al disclose perfluoro-(N-fluoro-N-(4-pyridyl)-methanesulfonamide) compound useful as a fluorinating agent (Abstract; page 298, compound 1).

Petrov et al disclose polyfluoro-2-alkanesulfonyl-3,3-dialkyloxaziridines (Abstract). Method B, production of  $(CF_3)_2C(OC_2H_5)N(H)SO_2C_4F_9$ , appears to anticipate the above listed claims.

The references are anticipatory.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Lis et al (*Synthesis and Antiarrhythmic Activity...*).

Lis discloses imidazolium salts useful as antiarrhythmic agents (Abstract). The compounds disclosed in Table I, no. 12, and Table II, no. 21 (page 698), anticipate the above listed claim.

Art Unit: 1751

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 731518.

EP'518 discloses electrolyte compositions containing various perfluoroalkylsulfonate salts (Abstract). The compounds disclosed in formula 1-2, when X is selected to be  $-\text{NSO}_2\text{Rf}_3$ , appear to meet each of the claim limitations (page 2). Note that M may any of the recited cations (page 3), and EP'518 teaches each of the instant electrochemical cell and solvent features (page 4, lines 40-47; page 5, lines 50-58; page 6, lines 7-18 and 53-59).

Although not disclosed in an inventive example, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made to produce the instantly claimed ionic compound since EP'518 clearly teaches ionic slats within the scope of the instant claims. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness in a genus - species chemical composition situation, as in any other 35 U.S.C. § 103 case, it is essential that Office personnel find some motivation or suggestion to make the claimed invention in light of the prior art teachings. See, e.g., *In re Brouwer*, 77 F.3d 422, 425, 37 USPQ2d 1663, 1666 (Fed. Cir. 1996) ("[T]he mere possibility that one of the esters or the active methylene group - containing compounds . . . could be modified or replaced such that its use would lead to the



Art Unit: 1751

specific sulfoalkylated resin recited in claim 8 does not make the process recited in claim 8 obvious "unless the prior art suggested the desirability of [such a] modification' or replacement." (quoting *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 902, 221 USPQ 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 493, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1442 (Fed. Cir. 1991) ("[A] proper analysis under § 103 requires, inter alia, consideration of . . . whether the prior art would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art that they should make the claimed composition or device, or carry out the claimed process."). In order to find such motivation or suggestion there should be a reasonable likelihood that the claimed invention would have the properties disclosed by the prior art teachings. The prior art disclosure may be express, implicit, or inherent. Regardless of the type of disclosure, the prior art must provide some motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the claimed invention in order to support a conclusion of obviousness. See, e.g., *Vaeck*, 947 F.2d at 493, 20 USPQ2d at 1442 (A proper obviousness analysis requires consideration of "whether the prior art would also have revealed that in so making or carrying out [the claimed invention], those of ordinary skill would have a reasonable expectation of success."); *In re Dow Chemical Co.*, 837 F.2d 469, 473, 5 USPQ2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988) ("The consistent

Art Unit: 1751

criterion for determination of obviousness is whether the prior art would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art that this process should be carried out and would have a reasonable likelihood of success, viewed in the light of the prior art."); *Hodosh v. Block Drug Co.*, 786 F.2d 1136, 1143 n.5, 229 USPQ 182, 187 n.5 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 479 U.S. 827 (1986).

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Pohmer et al (5,502,251).

Pohmer et al discloses imide salts. The salts of formula (I) (Abstract; Col 2), when m is 0, Rf is C1-2 fluoroalkyl, Y1 and Y2 are SO2 and Rh is alkyl, meet each of the above listed claim limitations. Note also that Pohmer discloses antistatic use (Col 1, lines 15-20), and the addition of solvent (Col 6; Col 7).

The reference is anticipatory.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Everaerts et al (5,851,376).

Everaerts discloses free-radically polymerizable compositions containing salt conductivity enhancers. The salts listed in formula (I) (Col 9), when Rf is C1-2 fluoroalkyl, and X is SO2R or SO2Rf, meet each of the above listed claim limitations. Note also that Everaerts discloses antistatic use

Art Unit: 1751

(Col 4, lines 40-45), and the addition of solvent (Col 13, lines 10-25).

The reference is anticipatory.

In view of the foregoing, the above claims have failed to patentably distinguish over the applied art.

The remaining references listed on forms 892 and 1449 have been reviewed by the examiner and are considered to be cumulative to or less material than the prior art references relied upon in the rejection above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Kopec whose telephone number is (571) 272-1319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1751

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Mark Kopec  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1751

MK

March 30, 2007